



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

REVIEWS AND BOOK NOTICES.

THEODOR ZAHN. *Forschungen zur Geschichte des Neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur.* III Theil. *Supplementum Clementinum.* 329 pp. Erlangen, 1884.

The volume before us contains an exhaustive treatment of the fragments of Clement of Alexandria which are preserved in various ecclesiastical writers and catenae; and it goes without saying that it is a monument of industry and learning. In the first 176 pages we have such a collection and discussion of the fragments as has never before been made; and the rest of the book is occupied with valuable supplementary matter, arranged in the following order: I. A discussion of Anatolius' treatise on the Passover. II. On certain fragments of a Greek Hieronymus, found in catenae on the Psalms. III. A further discussion of Theophilus of Antioch and his Commentary. IV. On the reading in I Tim. iii 16, with especial reference to two fragments of I Tim. in the Louvre. V. On the Teaching of the Twelve Apostles.

It would take a very large space to treat these supplements in the way that such work deserves, and there is a further difficulty that, in the third of the supplements, we should have to plunge into a controversy which is already heated sevenfold. We shall therefore confine ourselves to some remarks on the earlier part of the book, for which, we venture to think, Professor Zahn will not be altogether ungrateful.

In discussing the fragments of Clement which are preserved in the pages of the *Parallels* of St. John of Damascus, Dr. Zahn has used the printed edition of Lequien, which gives the florilegium in two recensions—viz.: from a Vatican MS, and (very imperfectly) from a MS presented by Cardinal Rochefoucauld to the Jesuit College at Paris, and hence known as the *Codex Rupefucaldi*. The latter MS has for a long time been inquired after in vain, and it is much to be desired that its locality should be indicated and the text contained re-examined. We hope to be able to report on these points in a forthcoming work on the *Fragments of Philo*.

What is more important even than the re-discovery of the Rochefoucauld MS, is the information (the details of which we postpone) that the National Library at Paris possesses an uncial MS of *Parallels* in some ways superior to either of the texts used by Lequien, and very useful in the work of identification of the fragments composing the *Parallels*. This MS is No. 923 among the Greek Codices, and by its aid we are able to throw some light on points concerning which Dr. Zahn was obliged to suspend his judgment, and to make some necessary corrections and additions to his work. Our notes are as follows:

P. 18. Paed. i 9. Also in Reg. f. 361 as from Clem. Rom.

P. 19. Paed i 81: *after* Par. Vat. 702 *add* and Reg. f. 338.

P. 20. *Add* Paed. ii 15 (D. 226): τὼν ἀμφὶ . . . προσεπεινῶν from Par. Rup. f. 239, reading καὶ κυπταζούσας, λιχνότητος.

P. 20. Paed. ii 44. The passage is found in Par. Reg. f. 119.

P. 20. Paed. ii 49. The passage is also in Par. Rup. f. 45, with the same readings as in the authorities given. A similar addition should be made to the next quotation (Paed. ii 51). Both the passages, with slight variations, in Reg. f. 23.

P. 20. Paed. ii 52. Also in Par. Reg. f. 114, reading *ἀσκεῖν σωφρονεῖν*.

P. 20. Add Paed. ii 52 (D. 260): *μόνον . . . ἐνεργοῦμενα*, from Par. Rup. f. 39 as *ἐκ τοῦ α' παιδαγωγοῦ*.

P. 20. Add Paed. ii 58 (D. 264): *Ἀπέστω . . . λόγων*, from Par. Rup. f. 109b.

P. 20. Paed. ii 60. Also in Rup. f. 278. Reg. f. 256b and f. 373.

P. 21. Paed. ii 68. Also in Reg. f. 209b.

P. 22. Str. i 12. Also in Reg. 116b, as from Δ ΣΤΡΟΜ.

P. 22. Add Str. i 13 (D. 12): *ἀλλὰ γὰρ . . . νοεῖσθαι*. From Rup. f. 109b.

P. 22. Add Str. ii 1 (D. 146): *τῷ ὄντι . . . ἐπαίοντας*. Rup. 109b reading *γνώσιν*.

P. 22. Add Str. ii 7 (D. 149): *οὔποτε ἐγκρινᾶναι . . . ὕδατος*. Par. Rup. f. 34b referred to Greg. Naz. (*τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἡτοι τοῦ δευτέρου στρωματ.*).

P. 22. Str. ii 9. Also in Reg. f. 85, and continued in Rup. f. 233b from *αὐτίκα . . . ἐπερηρισμένη*.

P. 22. Add Str. ii 12 (D. 153): *τεσσάρων . . . γνωσταί*, from Rup. f. 233b, reading, in l. 10, *αἰσθήσεων, ὀδεύουσα*; l. 12, *λέγει*; l. 14, *στ. μὴν*.

P. 22. Add Str. ii 40 (D. 171): *Ὁ τοῦ ἀπαθοῦς . . . βούλεται*.

This passage is printed by Zahn, on p. 53, among the 'Citate ungewisser Herkunft.' It is found in Rup. f. 58, reading *τὸ μὴ ἀποπεσεῖν* (sic Cod.), *ὑποπεσεῖν* for *συμπεσεῖν* (so Cod. Reg.) and *δεδίαται* *κακά*. Cod. Reg. expressly refers to the extract *ἐκ τοῦ β' στρωματ.*

P. 23. Str. ii 46. Referred to II Strom. in Reg. 102b, reading *δευτερον* for *Ἐπειτα δὲ*.

P. 23. Add Str. ii 76 (D. 195): *παράκειται . . . γνώσις*. Reg. f. 335b.

P. 23. Str. ii 87. Also in Rup. f. 71 and Reg. f. 72b.

P. 23. Str. ii 101. In Rup. f. 71, and again f. 274b. Also Reg. f. 72b, reading *εὐμετάβλητον*.

P. 23. Str. ii 123. Also Rup. f. 213b.

P. 23. Add Str. ii 123 (D. 225): *ἄσοις . . . συγκατασπόμενον*, in Rup. f. 237, with corrupted readings.

P. 23. Add Str. ii 124 (D. 225): *καὶ εἰ μὴδέπω . . . ἐλογίσθησαν*. Rup. f. 187, but very corrupt.

P. 23. Str. ii 144. Also in Reg. f. 390.

P. 23. Str. ii 145. Also from Θεοφίλῆς . . . *διαχειραγωγεῖν* in Rup. f. 194b, and again f. 271b, reading this time *διαχειραγωγῆσαι*.

P. 23. Str. ii 146. Also Reg. f. 108.

P. 24. Add Str. iii 43 (D. 270): *Θεοῦ . . . ἀδύνατον*, from Reg. 102b. This sentence should now be removed from p. 54.

P. 24. Str. iv 35. Also Reg. f. 276.

P. 24. Str. iv 38. Referred to 'Quis Dives,' in Reg. f. 179, through the misplacement of a title.

P. 24. Str. iv 74. Also Reg. f. 38b, and Rup. f. 48b.

- P. 24. Str. iv 93. Also Rup. f. 71, and Reg. f. 104.
- P. 25. Str. iv 141. Also Rup. f. 266, reading ἀποστασίαν.
- P. 25. Add Str. v 7 (D. 6): ὀλίγους . . . θέα. From Rup. f. 72.
- P. 25. Str. v 12 (D. 11, 3, 4): Reg. f. 228 (referred to II Strom.), but V Strom. Correctly in Rup.
- P. 25. Str. v. 25. Also Reg. f. 103.
- P. 26. Str. vi 65. Here there should be inserted, from p. 62, the fragment which Clem. Alex. cites from Clem. Rom. (i 48), and which Zahn has followed Grabe in removing from the genuine fragments, although he notes that it is really found in Clem. Alex. In Reg. f. 338, the passage (τοσούτω . . . εἶναι) is expressly referred to Str. vi. It should be noticed that Lightfoot, in his edition of Clement, reads μάλλον μείζων for μείζων in this passage; wrongly, I think, since μάλλον occurs in the immediately preceding words, and so the longer reading is a correction for μάλλον, which the fragment published by Zahn reads in both places.
- P. 26. Str. vi 99. Add at end, and so Rup. f. 19tb, Reg. 209b.
- P. 26. Str. vi 102. Also in Reg. f. 131.
- P. 26. Add Str. vi 103 (D. 201): οὐχ ὁ ἀπεχόμενος . . . ἐνεργητέον, from Rup. f. 200b, reading προεξεργάσεται.
- P. 26. Str. vi 109. In Reg. f. 361, for αὐτοῦ read τοῦ θεοῦ.
- P. 26. Str. vi 112. Also Reg. f. 285b.
- P. 26. Add Str. vi 151 (D. 237): οὐ περὶ . . . στρεπτέον from Rup. f. 109b, as ἐκ τῶν ἐκτῶν τῶν αὐτῶν.
- P. 27. Str. vi 161. Also in Reg. f. 102b, as also the next extract, where Reg. adds the words omitted in the printed Parallels: εἰ (l. ὁ) τι ἂν ὁ λόγος ὑπαγορεύη.
- P. 27. Str. vii 33. Also Reg. 284b.
- P. 27. Str. vii 41. Also Reg. 102b.
- P. 27. Add Str. vii 57 (D. 301): is given more at length in Rup. 233b, going on to περαιωνμένῃ, reading ληπτὸν for καταληπτικὸν and ἡδὴ εἰς ἀγάπην.
- P. 27. Str. vii 59. This passage is given twice in Reg., f. 335b and f. 286, adding καὶ ἐμπείρου the second time; it is also in Rup. f. 263.
- P. 27. Add Str. vii 73 (D. 315): ὅταν μὴ . . . γένος, from Rup. f. 200b.
- P. 27. Str. vii 80. The reference to ζ' στρωμ. is correctly made in Reg. f. 156.
- P. 27. Str. vii 82. Also Reg. f. 102b.
- P. 27. Str. vii 99. The same reference is made in Reg. f. 61 (reading δειδεῖν = διιδεῖν), and in Rup. f. 109b it is ἐκ τοῦ α' παιδαγωγοῦ, the text going as far as παροῦσ', and reading ἰδεῖν.
- P. 27. Add Str. vii 100 (D. 339) ὥς εἰκε . . . σεμνή, from Rup. f. 72.
- P. 28. Zahn's view concerning the quotation in Par. Vat. 643 is confirmed by Cod. Reg. f. 279, which expressly refers the passage to Strom. viii, and reads ἡτοι ὑφ' ἐαυτῆς for ὑφ' ἐαυτῆς.
- P. 28. Add Str. viii? Par. Vat. 480, and Reg. f. 149b. The passage from Ἐλεημοσύνας . . . ἐπιτύχης, is expressly given to Strom. viii by Reg. Zahn has printed it more at length on p. 49, from which it should now be removed.
- P. 28. Add Str. viii? Par. Vat. 570, and Reg. f. 223. The passage, οὐχ ἡ τῶν πράξεων . . . εἰλικρίνεια, is expressly given to Str. viii by Cod. Reg. Cod. Rup.

f. 195b, however, refers it to Philo. The passage which follows is rightly referred by Reg. to 'Quis Dives.' Under these circumstances, I think Zahn should remove the passage from the uncertain fragments on p. 55.

P. 29. Ecl. 11. Wrongly referred to Philo by Reg. 62b, which title really belongs to the following passage.

P. 29. Ecl. 47. In Reg. f. 274b, as far as ἀγανακτεῖν. The στρωμ. in the references is here only an abbreviated title of Clement, which leads to much confusion.

P. 30. Div. 11. Also in Reg. f. 186.

P. 30. Div. 20. Also in Reg. f. 223.

P. 30. Div. 21 (D. 399, 6-8). Zahn has omitted to notice that the passage is found again in Par. Vat. 315; also in Reg. f. 325, where the reference is simply to Clement.

P. 30. Div. 21 (D. 399, 10-15). This is found in Rup. f. 126b. With regard to the two passages which follow in Lequien, p. 383, the first of which is referred, in the Latin translation, to 'ejusdem ex epist. 21,' and the second, τοῦ αὐτοῦ, we observe that, although Cod. Rup. has the same title for the second passage, yet Cod. Reg. f. 99 refers it to Διδύμου, and reads τεταγμένως before βούντων. As to the former passage, it is more difficult to decide, especially as another exactly similar case is found in Rup. f. 143b of a quotation from the very same epistle, and with the heading, as here, giving it to Κλήμ. στρωματ. If the reference given in the Latin translation be a genuine one, it will be hard to deny the existence of a collection of letters circulating under the name of Clem. Alex. As far as I can tell from my notes, the first and second passages are continuous in Cod. Rup.

P. 30. Div. 39. The two quotations are found in Reg. f. 385b, 386.

P. 31, line 2. Note that Cod. Reg. also makes the false reference to I Strom.

P. 31, line 9. It should be added that Wordsworth also, in his *Hippolytus and Callistus*, treated the three passages of Clement as forming part of the treatise of Hippolytus: *περὶ τῆς τοῦ παντὸς αἰτίας*. The fact is that the text of Hippolytus must have been taken, in the first instance, from a collection of Parallels very like Cod. Reg., for in this MS the extracts of Clement follow in the order as printed on the long extract from Hippolytus.

P. 33. Frag. 6. The form given from Par. Vat. is found also in Cod. Reg. f. 101b, and in Rup. f. 130 (Κλήμεντος).

To the foregoing extracts from Clement. *De Pascha* should, perhaps, be added the following:

Τετάρηνται οἱ τῶν λέοντων σκύμνοι καθάπερ καὶ οἱ κύνες τίκεσθαι τνφλοί. The sentence has no title in Par. Vat. 531, but in Par. Reg. f. 201 it is Κλήμεντος εἰς τὸ πάσχα.

We come now to the Uncertain Fragments:

P. 53. Frag. 13 has been already identified.

P. 53. Frag. 14 is Philo, *Quaestiones in Genesim*. iv 40.

P. 53. Frag. 15 is from Theotimus the Scythian. The passage occurs again in Par. Vat. 643, and Cod. Reg. f. 279, where it is by both authorities referred to Θεοσίμου περὶ νηστείας. The fragment Par. Vat. 393 corresponds to Reg. f. 89. And here again it is expressly Θεοσίμου Κωνθίας. In Rup. f. 117, it is referred

to *Κλήμ. τοῦ στρωματ.* Zahn's foot-note, "wahrscheinlich ist *τε* zu streichen," is confirmed by Rup., which has neither *τε* nor *καὶ*.

P. 53. Frag. 16 is referred in Reg. f. 89 to the treatise 'Quis Dives,' where it will probably be found for a little searching. Also in Rup. f. 117, reading *ἀφίεται*.

P. 53. Frag. 19 has been identified.

P. 53. Frag. 20 is *Διδύμων · εἰς τὰς παροιμίας* in Reg. f. 89: also *Διδύμων* in Rup. f. 130.

P. 53. Frag. 21. This is *Κλήμεντος* in Cod. Reg. f. 120b: in Rup. 143b, however, the astonishing title already referred to is found, *Κλήμεντος στρωματέως ἐκ τῆς κα' ἐπιστολῆς*. This MS reads *κατεξιώμενος*.

P. 53. Frag. 22. Cod. Rup. f. 179 (reading *τύπος* for *τόπος*), refers this to V Strom.

P. 53. Frag. 23. I think it will be found, that both this sentence and the one that precedes it in the printed Parallels are given to Didymus in Reg. f. 201.

P. 53. Frag. 25. Reg. f. 330b as in Maximus and Melissa, and headed *Κλήμεντος*, as in Rup. f. 261.

To these fragments add:

Frag. 26 (*bis*). Par. Vat. 712: *οἱ πόντοι πανταχοῦ τῶν ἀγαθῶν χορηγοί*. Without a title, but referred to I Strom. in Reg. f. 363, where the title has accidentally slipped to the next passage (from 'Quis Dives'), and the title for 'Quis Dives' to the sentence again succeeding.

We now come to the fragments pronounced by Zahn to be spurious.

Frag. 3. Zahn is right in identifying the second sentence as Philo: it will be found in the treatise *De Decem Oraculis* (Mangey, ii 200).

Frag. 4. In Reg. f. 223, corresponding to Par. Vat. 570, this is referred to Didymus, and so, I think, we may take it. Cod. Rup., however, f. 195b, refers to *Κλήμεντος στρωματ. ἐκ τοῦ προτρεπτικοῦ*.

Frag. 5 is given to Evagrius in Par. Reg.

We subjoin seven new fragments of Clement, from the Par. Rup., and, without making any assumption that there are no more Clementine scraps in the same Codex, we simply want to facilitate matters for the next student who passes this way, and, in particular, for Professor Zahn, who will, no doubt, help us to identify these, in return for the large number of corrections and additions which we have made to his collection. They are as follows:

α. *Πᾶσα ἁμαρτία κὰν διαφορὰν ἔχη πρὸς ἑτέραν, ἀλλ' οὐν γε ἁμαρτία λέγεται νόμῳ ὑποπίπτουσα*. From Rup. f. 39, following a passage in II Paed.

β. *Κλήμεντος ἐπισκόπου τῆς Ἀλεξανδρίας · Ἐρεῖ τις · μηδὲν ζητῶμεν περὶ θεοῦ · φαῖν δ' ἂν · καὶ μὴν οὐδέποτε δεῖ παύσασθαι λέγοντας καὶ ἀκούοντας περὶ θεοῦ · πλὴν ὅσον ἐφίεται ἡ πίστις ὥστε λέγειν περὶ αὐτοῦ τὰ λεκτὰ καὶ ἀκοῦειν τὰ ἀκουστά*. From Rup. f. 55.

γ. *Ὅλγων ἢ ἀλήθεια καὶ τούτων ὅποσοι οἰοί τε ἀνευρεῖν αὐτὴν διὰ μακρᾶς ἐνδείξεως καὶ συνασκήσεως ἐπὶ τὴν θεωρίαν διαχειραγωγούμενοι*. From Rup. f. 72: *Κλήμ. ἐκ τοῦ α' στρωματ.*

δ. *Δεῖν οἶμαι τὸν ἀληθείας κηδόμενον οὐκ ἐξ ἐπιβολῆς καὶ φροντίδος τὴν φράσιν συγκεῖσθαι, πειρᾶσθαι δὲ ὀνομάζειν μόνον ὡς δυνατόν ὃ βούλεται · τοὺς γὰρ τῶν λέξεων ἐχομένους καὶ περὶ ταῦτα ἀσχολουμένους διαδιδράσκει τὰ πράγματα*. From Rup. 109b: *ἐκ τῶν αὐτῶν* (? Strom. vi).

ε. 'Ημεῖς τὸν ἀεὶ καὶ ἐν πᾶσι δίκαιον ἐπιθυμοῦμεν ἰδεῖν • ὅς μῆτε τὴν τῶν συνόντων καὶ ἐπεξιδόντων τοῖς πλημμεληθεῖσι μισοπονηρίαν εἰλαβοῦμενος μῆτε τὸν ἐξ αὐτῶν τῶν ἀδικουμένων κίνδυνον ὑφορώμενος διαμένει (Cod. διαμένοι) • ὁ γὰρ διὰ ταῦτα τοῦ πράττειν τι τῶν ἀδίκων ἀπεχόμενος οὐχ ἐκὼν χρηστός, φόβῳ δὲ ἀγαθός. From Rup. 200b (Κλήμ. στρωματ.).

ζ. τῷ τελείῳ οὐκ ἐν συμβόλοις πολιτικοῖς οὐδὲ ἐν ἀπαγορεύσει νόμον ἀλλ' ἐξ ἰδιοπραγίας καὶ τῆς πρὸς θεὸν ἀγάπης ἡ δικαιοσύνη (τοῦ αὐτοῦ) Rup. f. 200b.

ζ. 'Ελεγχος ἀνδρὸς ἤθους ἡ μετὰ τῶν τοιῶνδε συνουσία • ὅτε γὰρ φαῦλος ἐξ ἀνάγκης τοῖς ὁμοίοις συνέσται • ὅτε αὐτὸς πάλιν σῶφρων καὶ σοφὸς τοῖς τὰ αὐτὰ αὐτῷ μετιούσιν. Rup. f. 260b (Κλήμ. στρωμ.).

η. 'Επιστήμη τίς ἐστίν ἡ Χριστιανικὴ θεοσέβεια • ὃν τρόπον ἐκάστης ἐπιστήμης ἴδιοι λόγοι εἰσὶ, καθ' οὓς ἀναλαμβάνων περιγίνεται τὸ κατ' αὐτοὺς ἐπάγγελμα, οἷον ῥητορικὴ μὲν ἀπὸ τῶν ῥητορικῶν λόγων, ἱατρικὴ δὲ ἀπὸ τῶν ἱατρικῶν • οὕτως καὶ ἡ Χριστιανικὴ 'Επιστήμη ἀπὸ τῶν κατ' αὐτὴν λόγων περιγίνεται • ἴδιοι γὰρ οἱ Χριστιανικοὶ λόγοι εἰσὶν • ὥσπερ οὖν οὐκ ἐστὶ τοὺς ῥητορικοὺς λόγους ἀναλαμβάνοντα ἱατρὸν γένεσθαι, ἢ τοὺς ἱατρικοὺς ῥήτορα οὕτως οὐδὲ Χριστιανὸν ἀφ' Ἑλλήνων λόγων ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν Χριστιανῶν. Διὸ φημὶ τοὺς βουλομένους Χριστιανοὺς εἶναι δεῖ μόνους ἀναλαμβάνειν τοὺς τοῦ Χριστοῦ λόγους καὶ μηδὲν ἕτερον ζητεῖν τοῦτο γε αὐτοῖς γενέσθαι. Rup. f. 278. Following without discontinuity a quotation from II Paed. 60, headed τοῦ ἁγίου Κλήμεντος.

J. RENDEL HARRIS.

Calpurnii et Nemesiani Bucolica recensuit HENRICUS SCHENKL. Leipzig and Prague, 1885.

This excellent edition of the Eclogues of Calpurnius and Nemesianus, by the son of the well-known Vienna professor, Dr. Karl Schenkl, will be welcome to those who participate in the revived interest in the poetry of Rome, not in its well-worked, almost exhausted, Augustan era, but in its subsequent developments. Whatever the age of Calpurnius may be, whether the reign of Nero, as Bücheler and Schenkl think, or a later period, as was the earlier belief, the seven pastorals which have come down to us under his name deserve careful and minute study as poetry, as highly elaborated specimens of the artistic treatment of the hexameter; finally, as historical documents. From this last point of view I cannot but feel sorry that Herr Schenkl has thought it sufficient to refer his readers to the disquisitions of his predecessors. There should have been a chapter in which the chronological data are reviewed, and in which the palpable objections which lie against the Neronian date are considered and answered. For my own part, I will not deny that in reading successively each of the seven Eclogues, the doubts which the first of them raised as to that theory rose steadily with each of the series, and culminated in the seventh. Thus, no one with a shade of the historic sense can fail to see in IV 118 the most definite historic allusion to some enactment about treasure-trove; and will certainly not be contented to be told that Persius has a casual allusion to the same subject. Nothing short of a detailed examination of Roman law, as ascertainable on this point, will suffice to settle even this single question. Again, the description of the amphitheatre in Ecl. VII is minute, and should be compared point by point with the descriptions of Martial and